



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,597	10/23/2001	David Holbrook		1926
7590	08/22/2005		EXAMINER	
Terence Sean Sullivan P.O. Box 425475 Cambridge, MA 02142				HAILE, FEBEN
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/001,597	HOLBROOK ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Feben M. Haile	2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *October 23, 2001*.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because descriptive labels should be used when rectangular boxes are shown. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-12, 6-27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12, 14-24, and 34 of Published Application No. US 2003/0078978, hereinafter referred to as Lardin et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Regarding claim 1, Lardin et al. discloses a system comprising: a) storage means for the storage of messages; b) composition means for the composition of messages; c) display means for the display of messages; d) associative means for associating at least one of said portable messaging units with at least one of said user accounts, and e) communications means for conducting a data exchange with a messaging node, when in an immediate proximity of said messaging node; where a plurality of said portable messaging units are each capable of conducting said data exchange at a plurality of said messaging nodes, when within said immediate proximity, whereby a plurality of said portable messaging units may conduct two-way messaging via said messaging system when in said immediate proximity to at least one messaging node of said messaging system, and conduct user interface functions respective of location (**claims 1 and 2**).

Regarding claim 2, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said portable messaging units further include firmware means for controlling messaging operations (**claim 1**).

Regarding claim 3, Lardin et al. discloses wherein a plurality of said messaging nodes include a plurality of docking ports each accepting said portable messaging units (**claim 3**).

Regarding claim 4, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server gateway for all messaging traffic between said portable messaging units and the Internet (**claim 4**).

Regarding claim 5, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server with means for tracking and billing messaging traffic with said portable messaging units via said messaging nodes (**claim 5**).

Regarding claim 6, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said data exchange conducted between said portable messaging units and any network requires that at least one of said portable messaging units be physically introduced to said immediate proximity of at least one of said messaging nodes (**claim 6**).

Regarding claim 7, Lardin et al. discloses wherein the transfer of data between a portable messaging unit within said messaging system and any other type of electronic device requires that said transfer of data be conducted via said data exchange with at least one of said messaging nodes (**claim 7**).

Regarding claim 8, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said communications means include photonic transceivers within said portable messaging units and said messaging nodes (**claim 8**).

Regarding claim 9, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said communications means include supersonic transceivers within said portable messaging units and said messaging nodes (**claim 9**).

Regarding claim 10, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said communications means include low power radio transceiver equipment, with a communications range under 100 meters, within said portable messaging units and said messaging nodes (**claim 11**).

Regarding claim 11, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said communications means include a temporary data cable between at least one of said portable messaging units and at least one of said messaging nodes (**claim 10**).

Regarding claim 12, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said messaging nodes are geographically distributed in locations accessible to the public (**claim 12**).

Regarding claim 16, Lardin et al. discloses a method where said messaging node a) detects the presence of a portable messaging unit in an immediate proximity; b) automatically enters a data exchange with said portable messaging unit; c) identifies at least one user account associated with said portable messaging unit; d) triggers the delivery of outgoing messages from said portable messaging unit; e) identifies incoming messages addressed to user accounts associated with said portable messaging unit; f) delivers said incoming messages to said portable messaging unit, within a messaging system comprising a plurality of messaging nodes and a plurality of portable messaging units, where a plurality of said portable messaging units are each capable of conducting

said data exchange at a plurality of said messaging nodes, when within said immediate proximity (**claim 34**).

Regarding claim 17, Lardin et al. discloses further comprising the step of verifying that said user account has sufficient credit to receive incoming messaging traffic before said incoming message is delivered to said portable messaging unit (**claim 14**).

Regarding claim 18, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server, and the verification of said sufficient credit is performed by said central server (**claim 15**).

Regarding claim 19, Lardin et al. discloses further comprising the step of said messaging node proactively buffering incoming messages for said user account prior to the transport of said portable messaging unit to the immediate proximity of said messaging node (**claim 16**).

Regarding claim 20, Lardin et al. discloses further comprising the step of requesting incoming messages by said messaging node for said user account subsequent to the identification of said user account at said messaging node, for immediate delivery to said portable messaging unit (**claim 17**).

Regarding claim 21, Lardin et al. discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server, and further comprising the step of requesting incoming messages for said user account by said messaging node from said central server (**claim 18**).

Regarding claim 22, Lardin et al. discloses further comprising the step of transferring mail server information including a username and password for said mail server, from said portable messaging unit to said messaging node; and the step of retrieving said incoming messages from said mail server, prior to the delivery of said incoming messages to said portable messaging unit (**claim 19**).

Regarding claim 23, Lardin et al. discloses wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via photonic communications means (**claim 20**).

Regarding claim 24, Lardin et al. discloses wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via supersonic communications means (**claim 21**).

Regarding claim 25, Lardin et al. discloses wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via low power radio transceiver equipment, with a communications range under 100 meters (**claim 23**).

Regarding claim 26, Lardin et al. discloses wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via a temporary data cable (**claim 22**).

Regarding claim 27, Lardin et al. discloses wherein at least one of said incoming messages comprises a text message (**claim 24**).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 13-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Published Application No. US 2003/0078978, hereinafter referred to as Lardin et al. in view of Shirakawa (US 2001/0051990).

Regarding claim 13, Lardin et al. discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Lardin et al. fails to teach wherein said messaging system further comprises communications means for the transfer of messages to and from Internet e-mail addresses.

Shirakawa discloses an electronic mail transfer system that transfers electronic mail from one terminal to another through the Internet (**Figure 1 and page 1 column 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lardin et al. to incorporate the teachings of Shirakawa. The motivation being the ability to keep the secrecy of mail addresses when transferring electronic mail from one device to another.

Regarding claim 14, Lardin et al. discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Lardin et al. fails to teach wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server, and wherein said communications means for the transfer of messages to and from Internet e-mail addresses is located at said central server.

Shirakawa discloses an electronic mail transfer system, where an electronic mail transfer device sends electronic mail from one terminal to another through the Internet (**Figure 1 and page 1 column 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lardin et al. to incorporate the teachings of Shirakawa. The motivation being the ability to keep the secrecy of mail addresses when transferring electronic mail from one device to another.

Regarding claim 15, Lardin et al. discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Lardin et al. fails to teach wherein messaging nodes have direct Internet communications means for the transfer of messages to and from Internet e-mail addresses.

Shirakawa discloses an electronic mail transfer system that transfers electronic mail from one terminal to another through the Internet (**Figure 1 and page 1 column 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lardin et al. to incorporate the teachings of Shirakawa. The motivation being the ability to keep the secrecy of mail addresses when transferring electronic mail from one device to another.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 16-21, 24, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated Stewart (US 5,969,678).

Regarding claim 1, Stewart discloses a system comprising a) storage means for the storage of messages (**column 5 lines 32-40; storage is implied because the message originates from the mobile unit**); b) composition means for the composition of messages (**column 5 lines 32-40; composition is considered entered in by the user**); c) display means for the display of messages (**column 4 lines 6-9**); associative means for associating at least one of said portable messaging units with at least one of said user accounts (**column 5 lines 9-24**), and communications means for conducting a data exchange with a messaging node, when in an immediate proximity of said messaging node (**column 5 lines 24-31**); where a plurality of said portable messaging units are capable of conducting said data exchange at a plurality of said messaging nodes, when within said immediate proximity (**column 5 lines 24-40**), whereby a plurality of said portable messaging units may conduct two-way messaging via said messaging system when in said immediate proximity to at least one messaging node of said messaging system, and conduct user interface functions irrespective of location (**column 5 lines 24-31**).

Regarding claim 2, Stewart discloses wherein said portable messaging units further include firmware means for controlling messaging operations (**column 5 lines 41-56; firmware is considered the identification of the user so that the network may provide desired services by accessing appropriate providers**).

Regarding claim 3, Stewart discloses wherein a plurality of said messaging nodes include a plurality of docking ports each accepting said portable messaging units (**column 4 lines 10-23**).

Regarding claim 4, Stewart discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server gateway for all messaging traffic between said portable messaging units and the Internet (**Fig. 1 unit 15**).

Regarding claim 5, Stewart discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server with means for tracking and billing messaging traffic with said portable messaging units via said messaging nodes (**column 5 lines 9-23**).

Regarding claim 6, Stewart discloses wherein said data exchange conducted between said portable messaging units and any network requires that at least one of said portable messaging units be physically introduced to said immediate proximity of at least one of said messaging nodes (**column 5 lines 24-40**).

Regarding claim 7, Stewart discloses wherein the transfer of data between a portable messaging unit within said messaging system and any other type of electronic device requires that said transfer of data be conducted via said data exchange with at least one of said messaging nodes (**column 4 lines 37-49**).

Regarding claim 9, Stewart discloses wherein said communications means include supersonic transceivers within said portable messaging units and said messaging nodes (**column 5 lines 24-31**).

Regarding claim 10, Stewart discloses wherein said communications means include low power radio transceiver equipment, with a communications range under 100

meters, within said portable messaging units and said messaging nodes (**column 1 lines 44-55**).

Regarding claim 11, Stewart discloses wherein said communications means include a temporary data cable between at least one of said portable messaging units and at least one of said messaging nodes (**column 1 lines 44-55**).

Regarding claim 12, Stewart discloses wherein said messaging nodes are geographically distributed in locations accessible to the public (**column 5 lines 24-40**).

Regarding claim 16, Stewart discloses a method where said messaging node a) detects the presence of a portable messaging unit in an immediate proximity (**column 5 lines 42-57**); b) automatically enters a data exchange with said portable messaging unit (**column 5 lines 42-57**); c) identifies at least one user account associated with said portable messaging unit (**column 5 lines 42-57**); d) triggers the delivery of outgoing messages from said portable messaging unit (**column 6 lines 5-10**); e) identifies incoming messages addressed to user accounts associated with said portable messaging unit (**column 5 lines 42-57**); f) delivers said incoming messages to said portable messaging unit (**column 5 lines 42-57**), within a messaging system comprising a plurality of messaging nodes and a plurality of portable messaging units (**column 5 lines 24-31**), where a plurality of said portable messaging units are each capable of conducting said data exchange at a plurality of said messaging nodes, when within said immediate proximity ().

Regarding claim 17, Stewart discloses further comprising the step of verifying that said user account has sufficient credit to receive incoming messaging traffic before

said incoming message is delivered to said portable messaging unit (**column 5 lines 24-31**).

Regarding claim 18, Stewart discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server, and the verification of said sufficient credit is performed by said central server (**column 5 lines 9-23**).

Regarding claim 19, Stewart discloses further comprising the step of said messaging node proactively buffering incoming messages for said user account prior to the transport of said portable messaging unit to the immediate proximity of said messaging node (**column 7 lines 8-22; buffering occurs within the information providers, which is in communication with the access point**).

Regarding claim 20, Stewart discloses further comprising the step of requesting incoming messages by said messaging node for said user account subsequent to the identification of said user account at said messaging node, for immediate delivery to said portable messaging unit (**column 7 lines 8-22**).

Regarding claim 21, Stewart discloses wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server, and further comprising the step of requesting incoming messages for said user account by said messaging node from said central server (**column 7 lines 8-22**).

Regarding claim 24, Stewart discloses wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via supersonic communications means (**column 5 lines 24-31**).

Regarding claim 26, Stewart discloses wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via a temporary data cable (**column 1 lines 44-55**).

Regarding claim 27, Stewart discloses wherein at least one of said incoming messages comprises a text message (**column 4 lines 7-9**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 5,969,678) in view of Shirakawa (US 2001/0051990).

Regarding claim 13, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Stewart fails to teach wherein said messaging system further comprises communications means for the transfer of messages to and from Internet e-mail addresses.

Shirakawa discloses an electronic mail transfer system that transfers electronic mail from one terminal to another through the Internet (**Figure 1 and page 1 column 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Shirakawa. The

motivation being the ability to keep the secrecy of mail addresses when transferring electronic mail from one device to another.

Regarding claim 14, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Stewart fails to teach wherein said messaging system further comprises a central server, and wherein said communications means for the transfer of messages to and from Internet e-mail addresses is located at said central server.

Shirakawa discloses an electronic mail transfer system, where an electronic mail transfer device sends electronic mail from one terminal to another through the Internet (**Figure 1 and page 1 column 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Shirakawa. The motivation being the ability to keep the secrecy of mail addresses when transferring electronic mail from one device to another.

Regarding claim 15, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Stewart fails to teach wherein messaging nodes have direct Internet communications means for the transfer of messages to and from Internet e-mail addresses.

Shirakawa discloses an electronic mail transfer system that transfers electronic mail from one terminal to another through the Internet (**Figure 1 and page 1 column 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Shirakawa. The

motivation being the ability to keep the secrecy of mail addresses when transferring electronic mail from one device to another.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 5,969,678) in view of Schuetze (US 5,968,117).

Regarding claim 22, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 16. Stewart further discloses retrieving incoming messages from a mail server, prior to delivery of incoming messages to portable messaging unit (**column 6 lines 40-51**).

Stewart fails to teach transferring mail server information including a username and password for said mail server, from said portable messaging unit to said messaging node.

Schuetze discloses transferring mail server information, including a username and password for the mail server, from a portable messaging unit to a messaging node, where the portable messaging units are considered a user-interface device (**column 5 lines 14-33**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Schuetze. The motivation being the ability to verify a user when trying to access their email from a remote location.

7. Claims 8, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 5,969,678) in view of Extended Systems ("IrDA versus Bluetooth: A Complimentary Comparison), hereinafter referred to as Extended Systems.

Regarding claim 8, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Stewart fails to teach wherein said communications means include photonic transceivers within said portable messaging units and said messaging nodes.

Extended Systems discloses that it would have been obvious to use photonic communications means (page 1; "What is IrDA?").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Extended Systems. The motivation being the ability to gather information in a close proximity range without interference.

Regarding claim 23, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 16.

Stewart fails to teach wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via photonic communications means.

Extended Systems discloses that it would have been obvious to use photonic communications means (page 1; "What is IrDA?").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Extended Systems. The motivation being the ability to gather information in a close proximity range without interference.

Regarding claim 25, Stewart discloses the limitations of base claim 16.

Stewart fails to teach wherein data exchange between said portable messaging unit and said messaging node is conducted via low power radio transceiver equipment, with a communications range under 100 meters.

Extended Systems discloses that it would have been obvious to use a communications means that is capable of a range under 100 meters (page 2, "What is Bluetooth?").

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stewart to incorporate the teachings of Extended Systems. The motivation being the ability to transmit data when the device is brought within a specific range, without the need of pointing the device in a particular direction.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a) Ulrich et al. (US 6,052,735), Electronic Mail Object Synchronization Between a Desktop Computer and Mobile Device
- b) Mouly (US 5,878,033) A Process and Equipment for Broadcasting Messages to Mobile Radio Communication Stations
- c) Traeger (US 5,978,569), System Having Plurality of Docking Unit Receptacles for Transmitting Data Between Plurality of Portable Data Entry Terminals in Local Area Network with a Central Controller
- d) Nakao (US 20040208141), Message Data Processing Method for a Mobile Communications Terminal, Mobile Communications Terminal, and Message Data Processing Program for a Mobile Communications Terminal

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Feben M. Haile whose telephone number is (571) 272-3072. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ftt 072712005

Ricky Ngo
RICKY NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

8/16/05